1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiff, v. CITY OF SANTA ROSA, et al.,

Defendants.

JOHN PAUL JOHNSON,

Case No. 23-cv-02478-JSC

ORDER RE: JURY INSTRUCTIONS ON COMPARATIVE FAULT

Before the Court are the parties' proposed jury instructions and verdict forms. (Dkt. Nos. 92, 93, 96, 97, 98.) With regards to Plaintiff's Count IV for negligence, Defendants' proposed verdict form twice asks the question:

"What percentage of the plaintiff's harm do you assign to the following:

Plaintiff John Paul Johnson _____%

Defendant Christopher O'Neill %"

(Dkt. No. 92 at 3, 5.) The Court's understands these questions relate to Defendants' affirmative defenses that Plaintiff's damages award should be reduced based on his percentage of fault. (See, e.g., Dkt. No. 34 ¶¶ 81-86.) Defendants, however, did not submit proposed jury instructions regarding this defense or raise this defense in their trial brief. //

Accordingly, the Court ORDERS the parties to meet and confer regarding jury instructions on comparative fault. If Defendants intend for the jury to reach a verdict on comparative fault if they find for Plaintiff, then Defendants shall file proposed jury instructions by noon on Wednesday, January 7, 2026. If Defendants do not so desire, then Defendants shall file a response to this Order, by the same deadline, stating they withdraw questions 10 and 22 on their proposed

United States District Court Northern District of California verdict form and inform Plaintiff of the same.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 6, 2026

ACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
United States District Judge